

## **Final Meeting Notes**

### **13 February 2008**

**Location:** BLM office, 915 Walla Walla Ave., Wenatchee  
**For more info contact:** Casey Baldwin 509-664-3148 baldwcmb@dfw.wa.gov

---

**RTT Members Present:** Joe Kelly, Carmen Andonaegui, Russell Langshaw, Casey Baldwin, Kate Terrell, Tracy Hillman, Keely Murdoch, Cameron Thomas, John Arterburn, Michelle McClure (via phone), Chuck Peven, Tom Kahler, Dennis Carlson, Steve Hays

**Others present:** Steve Kolk, Julie Morgan, James White, Pamela Nelle, Joy Juelson,

**1) Review and adopt the agenda:** Two items were added to the end of the agenda, and Julie Morgan asked to give her update as the first agenda item to accommodate her schedule.

**2) Review and adopt revised scoring criteria (Biological Strategy App D.):** Casey went over the revisions to the scoring criteria that were suggested at a previous RTT meeting. There was some discussion regarding the some of the changes and edits. Casey pointed out that there was still a scoring criteria missing that was waiting on a work product from the Monitoring and Data Management Committee (MaDMC). The group agreed to look it over in more detail after the meeting and get final comments back to Casey by February 27<sup>th</sup> so it can be finalized and adopted at the March RTT meeting.

**3) CCNRD/The Watershed Company Request for Review of CMZ site 2:**

The RTT discussed the review summary statement memo and went over the major conclusions as developed by the workgroup that did the evaluation. Several excellent suggestions were made that required some wordsmithing. Casey offered to make those additions and re-circulate a clean copy by COB on Thursday (Feb 14<sup>th</sup>) and the RTT agreed to review it and make final comments by COB Tuesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>. Casey would then circulate the memo to the project sponsors after February 19th.

**4) UCSRB Update:**

-GSRO long-term priorities Table: Julie gave an update on the process and the current version of the table and asked if the RTT would be willing to review and comment on the long-term priorities table at the April meeting. She explained that the table is a way for the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office to find out what the local (Recovery Regions) priorities are for actions that need to be conducted by the state and federal agencies. All of the actions will come from the implementation schedule of the Recovery Plan. Carmen asked how much opportunity the agencies have had to contribute to it. Julie said they are working with them now on the short-term priorities table and that the agencies would

review the long-term table before it goes to the RTT. Julie gave a timeline that suggested it would be ready for RTT review by the April RTT meeting. The group agreed to look at it and make comments at the April meeting.

-Upper Columbia Lead Entity Coordination Meeting, Feb 21: Casey handed out a draft agenda and timeline for the Lead Entity process for the combined SRFB and HCP Tributary Fund process for 2008. He asked for input and let everyone know that they were welcome to join him at the February 21 meeting in Wenatchee. Two changes that Casey suggested were to 1) add a ½ day to the schedule before the June pre-proposals and the August RTT review day just in case there is more than 20 projects and 2) Add a week after the August 20 RTT review before comments are due to the citizens committee because the RTT needs more time to review and finalize their notes from that meeting/review. There was also concern that 5 days of project tours was too much. Kate suggested leaving the days as is but trying to consolidate as much as possible.

Casey mentioned that the February 21 meeting was where the “Project Summary Paragraph” would be discussed and a decision would be made regarding its potential requirement in the Upper Columbia SRFB applications.

-Other: James White explained that the UCSRB staff worked through an all H integration approach. They will meet individually with regulatory agencies and find out what actions will be conducted related to the other H’s

## **5) Monitoring and Data Management Committee (MaDMC) update:**

Keely described the current activities of the MaDMC, which included:

MadMC discussion of committee representation: The MadMC is not considering additional members but will solicit the input of Methow Basin field personnel when additional basin specific topics are address. People that will be included in the CC list include Gene Shull, Charlie Snow, and John Jorgenson.

The need to review and finalize the appendices to the UC monitoring strategy prior to development of the Methow appendix. Pamela Nelle provided an update on the status of the Wenatchee and Entiat appendices. She will be providing copies of these for MaDMC review and noted that we will need to write additional sections to include the remote PIT tagging and detection efforts in both basins.

Keely described the annual RTT monitoring coordination meeting that occurred in Chelan on February 11<sup>th</sup>. She said there was a great turnout and participation and the meeting was a success.

Keely presented a spreadsheet that was a summary of the prioritized data gaps that had been developed by the MaDMC. She asked that the RTT review it and

provide comments by March 3<sup>rd</sup> so that a decision could be made at the March RTT meeting to accept this approach to prioritizing data gaps in the Upper Columbia.

Casey described the MaDMC's vision for involvement in Methow Monitoring Coordination and that he intended to go over it with the Methow Recovery Council at their next meeting.

Keely also discussed the development of the MaDMC 2008 work-plan which includes Data Gap Prioritization, UC appendices and the development of a Methow monitoring plan, data management protocol, Appendix P follow up, review of data steward work-plan, and RTT analysis workshop.

#### **6) USBR Matrix of Pathways and Indicators Update:**

Cameron described that the USBR needed a tool to help assess biological information relevant to the reaches they are/will be working in. They need it to work at a smaller scale than the watershed level. Their objectives are to use it to help identify limiting factors (evaluate projects relative to estimate potential (local) benefits and prioritize potential projects). Another objective is to use it as a Level 1 and Level 2 effectiveness-monitoring tool to determine if their actions are working at the reach scale. Michelle pointed out that the approach is not effective at determining population level effects or if recovery is achieved (i.e. just because the habitat meets some objectives does not mean the population meets delisting criteria). Cameron said that another meeting is coming up on February 29th.

#### **7) Other items / overflow**

Shiraz model update: Michelle McClure said that Jon Honea has coded the entire Wenatchee and gone through the Implementation Schedule and coded presumed changes to the environment. He has developed a couple of scenarios, with the output being extinction risk and abundance and productivity. They would like to walk through the details, perhaps at the March RTT meeting. They will be looking for input to see if they incorporated the implementation schedule correctly and evaluate patterns in variability. Casey offered to work with Michelle on the timing and content of the presentation for the March meeting.

The regular session of the meeting was adjourned at 11:50.

A workgroup met in the afternoon and continued discussions and analysis of the Nason Creek Biological Benefits assessment. Casey will put together a summary of the suggested approach and arrange the next workgroup meeting.